

## A DESI DR1 Radial-Velocity Search for Dark Compact Companions: A Strong but Unconfirmed Candidate Around a dM0 Star

2 AIDEN SMITH<sup>1</sup>

3 <sup>1</sup>Independent Astronomer

### 4 ABSTRACT

5 We present a conservative, fully reproducible search for radial-velocity (RV) variability in the public  
6 Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI) Data Release 1 (DR1) Milky Way Survey ([Abdul Karim](#)  
7 et al. 2025). Using only per-epoch RV measurements, we identify stars whose velocity variability is both  
8 highly significant and robust under leave-one-out tests. A “negative space” validation pipeline then  
9 rejects ordinary luminous companions using Gaia DR3 astrometry ([Gaia Collaboration](#) et al. 2023),  
10 WISE infrared photometry (Wright et al. 2010; Mainzer et al. 2011), GALEX ultraviolet constraints  
11 ([Martin](#) et al. 2005; Morrissey et al. 2007), TESS and ZTF time-domain photometry ([Ricker](#) et al.  
12 2015; Bellm et al. 2019; [Graham](#) et al. 2019), deep Legacy Survey imaging ([Dey](#) et al. 2019), and  
13 archival X-ray and radio catalogs.

14 One system, Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832 (DESI TargetID 39627745210139276), emerges as the  
15 most extreme survivor. DESI provides four RV epochs spanning 38.9 days with a maximum catalog  
16 RV span  $\Delta RV_{\max} \approx 146 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . A constant-RV model is rejected at  $\Delta\chi^2 \approx 2.7 \times 10^4$  (DESI-only),  
17 and the variability remains highly significant under leave-one-out tests.

18 A key forensic update is that Gaia DR3 resolves a neighbor at  $\rho \simeq 0.69''$  with  $\Delta G \simeq 2.21$  mag,  
19 implying a  $G$ -band flux ratio  $b_G \simeq 0.13$  and requiring blend-aware validation. We perform blend-aware  
20 remeasurement of the DESI spectra using PHOENIX templates and physically motivated flux-ratio  
21 priors; the large RV swing persists across these remeasurements.

22 We then resolve the origin of previously observed arm-split pathologies by downloading per-exposure,  
23 per-camera DESI spectra (`cframe` products) and remeasuring RVs by wavelength region. Same-night  
24 exposures reveal that the full  $Z$ -arm RV is unstable when sky-dominated wavelengths (9000–9800 Å)  
25 are included, while the Ca II triplet window (8500–9000 Å) yields stable and repeatable RV behavior.  
26 Using only this empirically “trusted” window, we recover a large RV swing  $\Delta RV \approx 151 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (from  
27  $-85.6$  to  $+65.6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ), and we find that the DESI catalog RVs for the same-night pair are biased low  
28 by  $\sim 25 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  relative to the trusted-window RVs, consistent with sky-region instability affecting  
29 the catalog solution.

30 Finally, we verify Gaia astrometric quality metrics via a direct query to `gaiadr3.gaia_source`  
31 (script: `scripts/verify_gaia_metrics.py`), finding RUWE = 1.954 and astrometric excess noise  
32  $\epsilon_{AEN} = 0.90$  mas ( $16.5\sigma$  significant) at  $G = 17.273$ . These values indicate a poor single-source as-  
33 trometric fit consistent with astrometric complexity (orbital motion and/or duplicity), but are not  
34 uniquely diagnostic given the resolved neighbor. We classify Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832 as a  
35 *strong but unconfirmed* dark compact companion candidate: the RV swing persists under conservative,  
36 windowed, per-exposure analysis, but a definitive dynamical mass claim requires follow-up spectroscopy  
37 and/or high-angular-resolution imaging to separate blended components and to establish an orbit.

38 **Keywords:** Radial velocity(1332) — Compact objects(288) — M dwarfs(982) — Spectroscopy(1558)

(BHs)—are expected to be abundant in the Milky Way but are difficult to detect when not accreting or otherwise luminous. Radial velocities provide a purely gravitational discovery channel: a compact companion can induce large reflex motion in an ordinary star while contributing negligible light. Modern multi-epoch spectroscopic surveys are therefore natural hunting grounds for unseen companions.

DESI DR1 provides per-epoch RVs for millions of stars in the Milky Way Survey (Abdul Karim et al. 2025). While DESI was not designed as a time-domain survey, the combination of multi-epoch coverage, high spectral resolution, and uniform data processing enables a systematic search for RV outliers. In this work we:

1. define conservative RV-variability metrics that are robust to outliers;
2. scan the DESI DR1 Milky Way Survey for high-significance RV variables;
3. apply a multi-wavelength “negative space” filter that searches for *gravity without light*;
4. perform targeted orbital and forensic analyses of the strongest surviving candidate, including blend-aware remeasurement and per-exposure wavelength-region truth filtering.

All analysis scripts, configuration files, diagnostic plots, and machine-readable products are publicly available at:

<https://github.com/simulationstation/DESI-BH-CANDIDATE-SEARCH>

## 2. DATA SETS

### 2.1. DESI DR1 Milky Way Survey

We use per-epoch DESI DR1 Milky Way Survey RV products (Abdul Karim et al. 2025). For each epoch we extract:

- heliocentric radial velocity  $RV_i$  ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ );
- formal RV uncertainty  $\sigma_{RV,i}$  ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ );
- modified Julian date  $t_i$  (days);
- DESI TARGETID;
- Gaia DR3 SOURCE\_ID when available.

In addition, for the case-study target we download per-exposure, per-camera `cframe` spectra for the relevant exposures and remeasure RVs directly from wavelength sub-regions (Section 6.3).

### 2.2. LAMOST archival spectroscopy

We identify two public LAMOST spectra (ObsIDs 437513049 and 870813030) of the target. These spectra robustly support an early-M dwarf classification for the dominant light source. However, independent RV measurement of these spectra is internally inconsistent across methods (FITS-header values vs CCF refits and wavelength-split CCF), so we treat LAMOST RVs as *non-decisive* for orbit fitting and retain LAMOST primarily as a spectral-type constraint.

### 2.3. Gaia DR3 astrometry and duplicity

We verify key Gaia DR3 astrometric quality metrics via a direct `astroquery.gaia` query to `gaiadr3.gaia_source` (script: `scripts/verify_gaia_metrics.py`)

**Table 1.** Verified Gaia DR3 astrometric metrics for Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832.

Quantity	Value
Gaia $G$ magnitude	17.273
Parallax $\varpi$ (mas)	$0.12 \pm 0.16$
RUWE	1.954
Astrometric excess noise $\epsilon_{AEN}$ (mas)	0.90
AEN significance ( $\epsilon_{AEN}/\sigma_\epsilon$ )	16.5

An elevated RUWE (commonly RUWE  $\gtrsim 1.4$ ) indicates a poor fit of the five-parameter single-source astrometric model and is often associated with unresolved binaries, blends, or other astrometric complexity. The parallax is poorly constrained and we therefore do not adopt a Gaia-only geometric distance.

A major forensic update is that Gaia DR3 resolves a close neighbor at a separation  $\rho \simeq 0.688''$  with  $\Delta G \simeq 2.21$  mag. This neighbor lies within the DESI 1.5'' fiber aperture and must be treated as a potential blend contaminant.

### 2.4. Additional surveys

The multi-wavelength validation uses:

- WISE/2MASS photometry (Wright et al. 2010; Mainzer et al. 2011; Skrutskie et al. 2006);
- GALEX NUV constraints (Martin et al. 2005; Morrissey et al. 2007);
- TESS full-frame-image photometry (Ricker et al. 2015);

- ZTF multi-year  $g, r$  photometry (Bellm et al. 2019; Graham et al. 2019);
- Legacy Survey imaging (Dey et al. 2019);
- ROSAT/XMM/Chandra X-ray catalogs and NVSS/FIRST/VLASS radio surveys (non-detections used as upper limits).

### 3. RV VARIABILITY METRICS

#### 3.1. Single-target RV statistics

For each target with  $N$  RV epochs we define the maximum observed RV span:

$$\Delta\text{RV}_{\max} = \max_i (\text{RV}_i) - \min_i (\text{RV}_i).$$

**Table 2.** Definitions for Equation (1).

Symbol	Meaning
$S^{(-k)}$	Significance recomputed with epoch $k$ removed (dimensionless)
$k$	Index of the excluded epoch (dimensionless integer)
$S_{\min,\text{LOO}}$	Minimum of $S^{(-k)}$ over $k = 1, \dots, N$
$S_{\text{robust}}$	Conservative significance statistic used for selection
$\min(\cdot)$	Minimum operator
$N$	Number of RV epochs

To quantify the significance of variability we define:

$$S = \frac{\Delta\text{RV}_{\max}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_{\text{RV},i}^2}}. \quad (2)$$

**Table 3.** Definitions for Equation (2).

Symbol	Meaning
$S$	Global RV-variability significance (dimensionless)
$\Delta\text{RV}_{\max}$	Maximum RV span ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_{\text{RV},i}$	RV uncertainty at epoch $i$ ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )
$N$	Number of RV epochs
$i$	Epoch index
$\sum_{i=1}^N (\cdot)$	Sum over epochs $i = 1$ to $N$
$\sqrt{\cdot}$	Square-root operator

#### 3.2. Leave-one-out robustness and leverage

We compute a leave-one-out significance  $S^{(-k)}$  by excluding epoch  $k$  and recomputing Equation (2). We then define:

$$S_{\min,\text{LOO}} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq N} S^{(-k)}, \quad S_{\text{robust}} = \min(S, S_{\min,\text{LOO}}). \quad (3)$$

**Table 4.** Definitions for Equation (3).

Symbol	Meaning
$S^{(-k)}$	Significance recomputed with epoch $k$ removed (dimensionless)
$k$	Index of the excluded epoch (dimensionless integer)
$S_{\min,\text{LOO}}$	Minimum of $S^{(-k)}$ over $k = 1, \dots, N$
$S_{\text{robust}}$	Conservative significance statistic used for selection
$\min(\cdot)$	Minimum operator
$N$	Number of RV epochs

We also define a leverage statistic:

$$d_i = \frac{|\text{RV}_i - \bar{\text{RV}}|}{\sigma_{\text{RV},i}}, \quad d_{\max} = \max_i d_i, \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{\text{RV}}$  is the inverse-variance-weighted mean RV.

**Table 5.** Definitions for Equation (4).

Symbol	Meaning
$d_i$	Leverage of epoch $i$ (dimensionless)
$d_{\max}$	Maximum leverage over epochs indexed by $i$
$\text{RV}_i$	RV at epoch $i$ ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )
$\bar{\text{RV}}$	Inverse-variance-weighted mean RV ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )
$\sigma_{\text{RV},i}$	RV uncertainty at epoch $i$ ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )
$ \cdot $	Absolute value operator
$\max_i(\cdot)$	Maximum over epochs indexed by $i$

#### 4. NEGATIVE-SPACE VALIDATION PIPELINE

For each RV-variable candidate we apply a multi-wavelength filter designed to select systems with strong gravitational evidence for a companion but little corresponding light. Key checks include Gaia astrometry/duplicity (including explicit neighbor searches), WISE/GALEX constraints, TESS/ZTF photometry, deep imaging, and X-ray/radio catalog searches.

<sup>147</sup> Only one object, Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832,  
<sup>148</sup> survives all cuts and is subjected to detailed forensic  
<sup>149</sup> validation below.

## <sup>150</sup> 5. CASE STUDY: GAIA DR3 3802130935635096832

### <sup>151</sup> 5.1. DESI per-epoch RVs and extreme variability

**Table 6.** DESI DR1 per-epoch catalog RV measurements for Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832.

Epoch	Source	MJD	Date (UT)	RV $\pm \sigma_{\text{RV}}$ (km s $^{-1}$ )
1	DESI	59568.488	2021-12-20	$-86.39 \pm 0.55$
2	DESI	59605.380	2022-01-26	$+59.68 \pm 0.83$
3	DESI	59607.374	2022-01-28	$+26.43 \pm 1.06$
4	DESI	59607.389	2022-01-28	$+25.16 \pm 1.11$

<sup>152</sup> The maximum catalog RV span is  $\Delta \text{RV}_{\text{max}} \approx$   
<sup>153</sup> 146 km s $^{-1}$  over 38.9 days. A constant-RV model is  
<sup>154</sup> rejected at  $\Delta \chi^2 \approx 2.7 \times 10^4$  (DESI-only).

### <sup>155</sup> 5.2. Blend constraint from $\Delta G$

<sup>156</sup> The Gaia-resolved neighbor has  $\Delta G \simeq 2.21$  mag. The  
<sup>157</sup> corresponding  $G$ -band flux ratio is:

$$\text{<sup>158</sup> } b_G = 10^{-0.4\Delta G}. \quad (5)$$

**Table 7.** Definitions for Equation (5).

Symbol	Meaning
$b_G$	Flux ratio in Gaia $G$ band (neighbor/primary; dimensionless)
$\Delta G$	Gaia $G$ magnitude difference (mag)
$10^{(\cdot)}$	Base-10 exponential
0.4	Magnitude-to-log <sub>10</sub> flux conversion factor

<sup>159</sup> With  $\Delta G \simeq 2.21$ ,  $b_G \simeq 0.13$ . Because the neighbor  
<sup>160</sup> is close and likely redder, the effective flux ratio can be  
<sup>161</sup> larger in redder DESI channels.

### <sup>162</sup> 5.3. Why simple flux dilution cannot create a 146–151 <sup>163</sup> km s $^{-1}$ swing

<sup>164</sup> If an RV estimator behaved like a linear flux-weighted  
<sup>165</sup> centroid of two spectra, the measured RV would be  
<sup>166</sup> bounded by the flux-weighted average. In the small- $b$   
<sup>167</sup> limit, the maximum blend-induced bias scales approxi-

<sup>168</sup> mately as:

$$\text{<sup>169</sup> } |\Delta \text{RV}_{\text{blend}}| \lesssim b |\text{RV}_2 - \text{RV}_1|, \quad (6)$$

<sup>170</sup> so that even a large component separation  
<sup>171</sup>  $|\text{RV}_2 - \text{RV}_1| \sim 200$  km s $^{-1}$  implies  $|\Delta \text{RV}_{\text{blend}}| \sim$   
<sup>172</sup> 26 km s $^{-1}$  for  $b \simeq 0.13$ .

**Table 8.** Definitions for Equation (6).

Symbol	Meaning
$ \Delta \text{RV}_{\text{blend}} $	Magnitude of blend-induced RV bias (km s $^{-1}$ )
$b$	Flux ratio (neighbor/primary; dimensionless)
$\text{RV}_1$	RV of the dominant-light component (km s $^{-1}$ )
$\text{RV}_2$	RV of the contaminating component (km s $^{-1}$ )
$ \cdot $	Absolute value operator
$\lesssim$	“Less than or approximately equal to”

<sup>173</sup> This bound does *not* rule out more pathological failure  
<sup>174</sup> modes (e.g. a pipeline locking onto different components  
<sup>175</sup> across epochs or wavelength-dependent template mis-  
<sup>176</sup> match), motivating the blend-aware and per-exposure  
<sup>177</sup> truth filters below.

## <sup>178</sup> 6. FORENSIC TRUTH FILTERING: <sup>179</sup> BLEND-AWARE AND WAVELENGTH-REGION <sup>180</sup> RV TESTS

### <sup>181</sup> 6.1. Blend-aware DESI remeasurement

<sup>182</sup> We re-fit the DESI spectra using PHOENIX templates  
<sup>183</sup> for an early-M primary and a late-M neighbor, per-  
<sup>184</sup> forming  $\chi^2$  minimization with inverse-variance weights  
<sup>185</sup> and physically motivated priors on flux ratio. Across  
<sup>186</sup> reasonable template choices and fixed blend fractions  
<sup>187</sup> ( $b \in \{0.05, 0.13, 0.20\}$ ), the inferred combined-arm RV  
<sup>188</sup> swing remains comparable to the catalog swing, indi-  
<sup>189</sup> cating that the large RV excursion is not an obvious  
<sup>190</sup> artifact of neglecting a  $\sim 13\%$  contaminant.

<sup>191</sup> However, model-comparison statistics (e.g.  $\Delta \text{BIC}$ ) can  
<sup>192</sup> prefer two-component fits even when  $b$  is fixed to un-  
<sup>193</sup> realistically small values. Because reduced chi-squared  
<sup>194</sup> values remain  $\chi^2_\nu \gg 1$  in many low-resolution fits, we  
<sup>195</sup> interpret such preferences as being driven primarily by  
<sup>196</sup> template mismatch (model misspecification), not as de-  
<sup>197</sup> cisive evidence that blending explains the RV variability.

### <sup>198</sup> 6.2. Per-exposure, per-camera arm-discrepancy <sup>199</sup> diagnosis

<sup>200</sup> Motivated by earlier arm-split pathologies in coadds,  
<sup>201</sup> we downloaded per-exposure DESI `cframe` products for

<sup>202</sup> EXPIDs 114768, 120194, 120449, and 120450. We renormalize formal uncertainties by reduced chi-squared  $\chi^2_\nu$  and estimate RV uncertainties using a curvature-based  $\Delta\chi^2 = 1$  criterion.

<sup>206</sup> Same-night exposures (120449 and 120450; 15 minutes apart) show:

- <sup>208</sup> •  $R$ -arm RVs are stable and consistent between exposures.
- <sup>210</sup> • Full  $Z$ -arm RVs are unstable, showing a  $\sim 34 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  discrepancy between exposures.
- <sup>212</sup> • Within  $Z$ , the Ca II triplet region is stable (few  $\text{km s}^{-1}$ ), while the sky-dominated red end is unstable.

### <sup>215</sup> 6.3. Trusted-window RV curve (Ca II triplet, 8500–9000 Å)

<sup>217</sup> We define the Ca II triplet window (8500–9000 Å) as an empirically trusted window for RV inference for this target. Table 9 reports per-exposure RVs derived using only this window.

**Table 9.** Per-exposure RVs from the trusted window (Ca II triplet, 8500–9000 Å).

EXPID	MJD	Trusted RV	Catalog RV	Trusted – Catalog
114768	59568.488	−85.6	−86.39	+0.8
120194	59605.380	+65.6	+59.68	+5.9 <sup>261</sup>
120449	59607.374	+53.1	+26.43	+26.7 <sup>262</sup>
120450	59607.389	+50.3	+25.16	+25.1 <sup>263</sup>

<sup>221</sup> The trusted-window RV swing is  $\Delta\text{RV} \approx 151.2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  (from  $-85.6$  to  $+65.6 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ), consistent with (and slightly larger than) the catalog-scale swing. The same-night pair is biased low in the catalog by  $\sim 25 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , consistent with the catalog solution being pulled by the unstable sky-dominated red end of the  $Z$  arm.

### <sup>227</sup> 6.4. Same-night residual discrepancy and systematic floor

<sup>229</sup> Although the trusted window dramatically improves stability, the same-night exposures differ by  $\Delta\text{RV} \approx 2.8 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The curvature-based uncertainties for the trusted-window fits are  $\lesssim 0.4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  per exposure, implying formal high significance. However, reduced chi-squared values remain  $\chi^2_\nu > 1$  (typically 2–7), indicating residual template mismatch and/or remaining systematics. We therefore interpret the same-night residual as

<sup>237</sup> evidence for a few  $\text{km s}^{-1}$  systematic floor in windowed DESI RVs for this blended M-dwarf target, even in the trusted window.

## <sup>240</sup> 7. PHOTOMETRIC, INFRARED/UV, X-RAY, AND <sup>241</sup> RADIO CONSTRAINTS

<sup>242</sup> TESS photometry shows no deep eclipses or large coherent modulation. ZTF photometry limits large-amplitude rotational modulation, disfavoring purely activity-driven explanations for a  $\sim 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  swing. WISE colours ( $W1 - W2 \simeq 0.05$ ) show no strong IR excess. GALEX NUV non-detection disfavors a hot WD companion. No significant X-ray or radio counterpart is found in major catalogs, consistent with a non-interacting (quiescent) system.

## <sup>251</sup> 8. LIMITATIONS

<sup>252</sup> The system remains unconfirmed due to:

- <sup>253</sup> Sparse DESI cadence (four epochs; two nearly simultaneous) and intrinsic period aliasing.
- <sup>255</sup> Confirmed close neighbor inside the fiber: blend-aware inference is mandatory.
- <sup>258</sup> Residual systematics at the few  $\text{km s}^{-1}$  level persist even in the trusted window.
- <sup>260</sup> LAMOST RVs are not decisive due to internal inconsistencies across extraction methods.
- <sup>262</sup> Gaia RUWE/AEN are elevated but are not uniquely attributable to orbital wobble given duplicity.

## <sup>264</sup> 9. CONCLUSIONS

<sup>265</sup> Gaia DR3 3802130935635096832 is an extreme DESI DR1 RV variable with a large catalog RV swing and a strong “darkness” profile (no strong IR/UV excess, no large photometric modulation, no catalogued X-ray/radio counterpart). Gaia DR3 confirms a close neighbor at  $\rho \simeq 0.69''$ , motivating blend-aware and wavelength-dependent validation.

<sup>272</sup> Per-exposure, per-camera validation identifies the sky-dominated red end of the DESI  $Z$  arm as the source of the previously observed instability; restricting to the Ca II triplet window yields a trusted-window RV curve with a  $\sim 151 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  swing and explains why the catalog RVs for the same-night pair were biased low.

<sup>278</sup> We therefore retain this system as a *strong but unconfirmed* dark compact companion candidate. The highest-value next step is spatially resolved, high-resolution spectroscopy and/or high-angular-resolution imaging to separate the blended components and convert the large RV swing into a definitive dynamical mass constraint.

285        10. DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY  
 286        (INCLUDING REQUIRED ARCHIVE DOIS)

287        This work used public survey and archive data. Where  
 288 required by journal policy, we cite dataset DOIs for  
 289 MAST-hosted and IPAC/IRSA-hosted data products.

290        10.1. *MAST-hosted datasets (TESS, GALEX)*

291        All TESS Full Frame Images used in this work are  
 292 available at MAST: [10.17909/3Y7C-WA45](https://doi.org/10.17909/3Y7C-WA45).

293        All GALEX catalog constraints used in this  
 294 work (GALEX/MCAT) are available at MAST:  
 295 [10.17909/T9H59D](https://doi.org/10.17909/T9H59D).

296        10.2. *IPAC/IRSA-hosted datasets (WISE, 2MASS,  
 297 ZTF)*

298        The AllWISE Source Catalog used in this work is  
 299 available at IRSA: [10.26131/IRSA1](https://doi.org/10.26131/IRSA1).

300        The 2MASS All-Sky Point Source Catalog used in this  
 301 work is available at IRSA: [10.26131/IRSA2](https://doi.org/10.26131/IRSA2).

302        ZTF photometric data access for this work used IRSA  
 303 services associated with: [10.26131/IRSA539](https://doi.org/10.26131/IRSA539).

304                  10.3. *Reproducibility*

305        All scripts, configuration files, diagnostic plots, and  
 306 machine-readable results used in this work are publicly  
 307 available at:

308

309 <https://github.com/simulationstation/DESI-BH-CANDIDATE-S>

310        *Software:* Astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al.  
 311 2013, 2018), Astroquery (Astroquery Collaboration et  
 312 al. 2019), Lightkurve (Lightkurve Collaboration et al.  
 313 2018), NumPy (NumPy Developers 2020), SciPy (SciPy  
 314 1.0 Contributors et al. 2020)

315        *Facilities:* DESI, Gaia, LAMOST, TESS, GALEX,  
 316 WISE, ZTF

## REFERENCES

- 317 Abdul Karim, M., et al. 2025, arXiv:2503.14745  
 318 Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., et al. 2013, A&A,  
 319 558, A33  
 320 Astropy Collaboration, Price-Whelan, A. M., et al. 2018,  
 321 AJ, 156, 123  
 322 Astroquery Collaboration, Ginsburg, A., et al. 2019, AJ,  
 323 157, 98  
 324 Bellm, E. C., et al. 2019, PASP, 131, 018002  
 325 Dey, A., et al. 2019, AJ, 157, 168  
 326 Gaia Collaboration, et al. 2023, A&A, 674, A1  
 327 Graham, M. J., et al. 2019, PASP, 131, 078001  
 328 Lightkurve Collaboration, et al. 2018, ascl:1812.013  
 329 Martin, D. C., et al. 2005, ApJL, 619, L1  
 330 Mainzer, A., et al. 2011, ApJ, 731, 53  
 331 Morrissey, P., et al. 2007, ApJS, 173, 682  
 332 Harris, C. R., et al. 2020, Nature, 585, 357  
 333 Ricker, G. R., et al. 2015, JATIS, 1, 014003  
 334 Virtanen, P., et al. 2020, Nat. Methods, 17, 261  
 335 Skrutskie, M. F., et al. 2006, AJ, 131, 1163  
 336 Wright, E. L., et al. 2010, AJ, 140, 1868